

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF VIRGINIA
Alexandria Division**

DORA L. ADKINS,)	
)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	No. 1:22-cv-01009 (MSN/IDD)
)	
AMERICA EXPRESS TRAVEL RELATED)	
SERVICES CO., INC.,)	
Defendant.)	
)	

ORDER

THIS MATTER comes before the Court on *pro se* Plaintiff Dora L. Adkins' Motion for Leave from the Court to File a Complaint (Dkt. No. 1) and Application to Proceed in District Court Without Prepaying Costs or Fees (Dkt. No. 2). For the reasons stated below, the Court DENIES the motions.

This is Plaintiff's thirty-eighth¹ lawsuit in this district. On October 1, 2021, this Court

¹ See *Adkins v. Public Storage*, 1:16-cv-01556-JCC-IDD; *Adkins v. Alexandria Towers Investor, LLC*, 1:16-cv00491-JCC-TCB; *Adkins v. Whole Foods Market Group, Inc.*, 1:16-cv-0031-CMH-JFA (EDVA); *Adkins v. City Of Fairfax - GMU Crimesolvers, Inc.*, 1:15-cv-00879-ICC-MSN; *Adkins v. Bank of America, N.A.*, 1:14-cv-00563- GBL-JFA; *Adkins v. Fairfax County School Board*, 1:09-mc-00027-GBL-TCB (EDVA); *Adkins v. Fairfax County School Board, et al.*, 1:08-cv-00091-JCC-JFA; *Adkins v. Fairfax County School Board*, 1:08-mc-00050-GBL-TRJ; *Adkins v. Fairfax County School Board*, 1:07-mc-00035-GBL-TCB; *Adkins v. Fairfax County School Board*, 1:05- mc-00005-GBL-BRP; *Adkins v. Fairfax County School Board*, 1:04-mc-00048-GBL-TCB; *Adkins v. Fairfax County School Board*, 1:03-cv-01177-GBL; *Adkins v. Fairfax County School Board*, 1:04-mc-00053-JCC-TRJ; *Adkins v. Fairfax County School Board*, 1:99-cv-00304-LMB; *Adkins v. Fairfax County School Board*, 1:98-cv-01071-LMB; *Adkins v. Fairfax County Board of Education*, 1:97-cv-00835-AVB; *Adkins v. HBL, LLC*, 1:17-cv-0074-TSE-TCB; *Adkins v. Whole Food Market Group, Inc.*, 1:17-cv-1023-AJT-JFA; *Adkins v. HEI Tyson's Corner, LLC*, 1:18-cv00291-AJT-IDD; *Adkins v. Dulles Hotel Corporation*, 1:20-cv-00361-RDA-IDD; *Adkins v. Starbucks Corporation*, 1:20-cv-01409-AJT-TCB; *Adkins v. Hyatt Corporation*, 1:20-cv-01410-AJT-MSN; *Adkins v. Mercedes-Benz USA, LLC*, 1:21-cv-00419-RDA-JFA; *Adkins v. Tyson's Lodging, LLC*, 1:22-cv-00553-AJT-WEF; *Adkins v. Fitness International, LLC*, 1:22-cv-00577-PTG-IDD; *Adkins v. Fitness International, LLC*, 1:22-cv-00749-PTG-WEF; *Adkins v. Ashford TRS Alexandria, LLC*, 1:22-cv-00790-PTG-WEF; *Adkins v. American Service Center Associates of Alexandria, LLC*, 1:22-cv-00915-RDA-IDD; *Adkins v. The Ritz-Carlton Hotel Company, LLC*, 1:22-cv-00934-CMH-WEF; *Adkins v. Hilton Worldwide Holdings, Inc.*, 1:22-cv-00957-CMH-JFA; *Adkins v. SP Hotel, LLC*, 1:22-cv-01017-CMH-IDD; *Adkins v. Driftwood Speical Servicing, LLC*, 1:22-cv-00109-AJT-IDD; *Adkins v. Merrifield Hotel Associates, L.P.*, 1:22-cv-00399-AJT-IDD; *Adkins v. American Service Center Associates, LLC*, 1:22-cv-00956-LMB-WEF; *Adkins v. Fitness International, LLC*, 1:22-cv-01130-PTG-WEF; *v. Adkins et al.*, 1:22-cv-01114-LMB-IDD.

entered a Pre-Filing Injunction Order against Adkins given her “extensive history of filing unsubstantiated lawsuits for the alleged injuries connected to food or chemical poisoning.” *Adkins v. Hyatt Corp.*, 1:20-cv-1410-AJT-MSN, (Dkt. No. 41) at 4. The Order enjoined Adkins from filing any complaints related to allegations of food or chemical poisoning without leave of the Court. *Id.* On August 17, 2022, this Court entered another Pre-Filing Injunction Order against Adkins enjoining her from filing any complaint related to any legal theory injuries or damages arising out of the use of her vehicle or any other form of transportation. *Adkins v. Mercedes-Benz USA, LLC*, 1:21-cv-419-RDA-JFA, (Dkt. No. 25) at 1.

In the present Complaint, attached to her motion for leave to file the complaint, Plaintiff alleges Defendant American Express Travel Related Services Company, Inc. caused plaintiff economic and emotional injuries through its failure to provide required disclosures on her credit card billing statements. Dkt. No. 1-1.

Courts must liberally construe *pro se* civil complaints, *Gordon v. Leeke*, 574 F.2d 1147, 1151 (4th Cir. 1978); nevertheless, “[p]rinciples requiring generous construction of *pro se* complaints are not . . . without limits.” *Beaudett v. City of Hampton*, 775 F.2d 1274, 1278 (4th Cir. 1985). The Complaint must comply with Rule 8 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, which requires parties to offer “short and plain statement[s]” of their claims. Fed. R. Civ. P. 8(a). Further, the Complaint must provide each defendant with fair notice of the facts and legal basis upon which their liability rests. *See Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly*, 550 U.S. 544, 555 (2007).

The Court has reviewed the Complaint and Motion and finds Ms. Adkins’ Complaint does not plausibly allege a cognizable claim and that leave of the Court is not warranted. For that reason it is

ORDERED that Plaintiff’s Motion for Leave from the Court to File a Complaint (Dkt. No.

1) is DENIED; it is further

ORDERED that Plaintiff's Application to Proceed in District Court Without Prepaying Costs or Fees (Dkt. No. 2) is DENIED AS MOOT.

The Clerk is directed to mail a copy of this Order to Plaintiff at the address listed on the Motions and Complaint.

/s/

Hon. Michael S. Nachmanoff
United States District Judge

October 17, 2022
Alexandria, Virginia